

**Farmer-to-Farmer - Russia
Second Quarterly Report – FY 2000
First Semi-Annual Report – FY 2000
To USAID**

January 1 to March 31, 2000

Cooperative Agreement No. FAO-A-00-99-00016-00

Submitted by

**ACDI/VOCA
50 F Street, NW Suite 1075
Washington, DC 20001**

**FARMER-TO-FARMER PROGRAM CONSORTIUM
ACDI/VOCA, LAND O' LAKES, and WINROCK INTERNATIONAL
RUSSIA
(USAID Cooperative Agreement # FAO-A-00-99-00016-00)
QUARTERLY REPORT
SECOND QUARTER FY00
January 1 – March 31, 2000**

I. PROGRAM OVERVIEW AND IMPACT ANALYSIS

A. Objectives

ACDI/VOCA, Land O' Lakes, and Winrock International have joined forces to create the Farmer-to-Farmer Consortium responsible for implementing the Russia Farmer-to-Farmer Program (FtF). The FtF Russia Program will strengthen the capacity of host organizations at three levels of the "building blocks of sustainability" including (1) the firm-level, (2) agricultural support organizations, and (3) financial institutions. The program will retain its unique people-to-people characteristic by providing direct assistance to farm producers and agricultural enterprises. However, emphasis will be placed on increasing the financial sustainability and service delivery capacity of ASOs (associations, cooperatives, and business support institutions) providing business and technology transfer services to agricultural clients. The program will also strengthen rural credit financial institutions and assist clients in accessing financing and attracting investments.

The FtF Consortium has identified four common objectives of the program to support the model of program interventions. The four objectives will serve as the guiding principle for the Consortium upon which the Russian strategy is based.

- | | |
|----------------------|---|
| Program Goal: | To assist in increasing food production and distribution, and improving the effectiveness of the farming and marketing operations of farmers. |
| Objective 1: | Develop and disseminate a set of best practices for volunteer technical assistance. |
| Objective 2: | Increase the sustainability of private agricultural enterprises. |
| Objective 3: | To increase the capacity of support organizations to achieve sustainable service delivery and advocacy. |
| Objective 4: | To strengthen rural finance systems to provide credit and other services to agricultural enterprises. |

B. Impact Analysis

As demonstrated by the attached Tables and remainder of the narrative report, actual impact based on the volunteer assignments to both microenterprise and macro-economic entities is still in the infant stage. As outlined in the Farmer-to-Farmer proposal submitted by ACDI/VOCA and the Farmer-to-Farmer Consortium, a specific monitoring program has been developed for a more accurate and comprehensive analysis of the impact of volunteers on the Russian economy, both at the firm-level, and to a small extent, the macro-economic level (a

detailed reporting of the progress made by the Farmer-to-Farmer Consortium in establishing and implementing the monitoring and evaluation component is described in Section IV of this report).

The staple of the M & E system is based on the monitoring and evaluation of the individual host organizations at periodic intervals of six to nine months (as determined by the individual volunteers who provide technical assistance to those hosts). This report comes at the sixth month of implementation of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program and the first rounds of host evaluation are currently underway. An analysis of the economic impact of the Farmer-to-Farmer volunteers currently does not exist in enough of a capacity to provide any substantive confirmation of impact. It is still too early in the process to even witness legitimate rises in revenue for firm-level host organizations, nor has enough time passed for the completion of lending cycles with banks and credit cooperatives.

Section III, below, does demonstrate some initial success with host organizations based on the volunteer technical assistance. Once the host organizations have had the ability to review, understand and implement the recommendation of FtF volunteers, and witness the fruits of that technical assistance in increased capacity, efficiency and revenue, a more comprehensive analysis of the project's impact can be examined and reported on.

C. U.S. Public Outreach

The Farmer-to-Farmer project has experienced tremendous support from volunteers in creating a public outreach program that has proven very supportive and successful. Though not all of the volunteers have the ability to do outreach, several have gone above and beyond their sense of volunteerism in the realm of public outreach. This has culminated in a number of local newspaper articles about the volunteer's travels, presentations at local clubs, associations, businesses and church groups, and word of mouth recruitment by volunteers of their family, friends, and neighbors. As time progresses, more and more people from communities that tend to be less connected to international linkages are becoming less skeptical of programs such as the Farmer-to-Farmer project. With the assistance of recently returned volunteers, who speak of their positive experiences, the public in general is becoming more accepting of the goals and objectives of our programs.

In addition, ACDI/VOCA held its quarterly volunteer debriefing in March 2000, where a handful of ACDI/VOCA volunteers were invited to come and speak about their experience to an audience, which including USAID and other donor organization staff, Congressional staff, and members of the wider development and international community.

D. Administration

After some difficulty in arranging the working relationship between the Farmer-to-Farmer Consortium partners, the project has settled into a well-operating form that has proven advantageous for all organizations involved. In the past six months, it has proven necessary to make arrangements and accommodations for the various styles and functions of the different organizations in program approach and structure, volunteer recruitment, and communication. However, the FtF Consortium has managed to work out the operating structure and has since

picked up the pace of recruitment and fielding of the volunteers. Though this has proven a challenge, the program has benefited tremendously from the experience.

II. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD

During the second quarter, the sub-agreements between ACDI/VOCA and Winrock International and Land O' Lakes were completed and signed. Winrock International was active in recruiting volunteers and the first volunteers to travel to Russia under Winrock's sub-grant will be fielded in the third quarter. Land O' Lakes did not begin to recruit volunteers, but was active in opening the new FtF regional office in Novosibirsk. This office will be responsible for Western Siberia operations including Novosibirsk, Omsk and Tomsk. Mr. Slava Sundikov assumed the role of Regional Program Manager for Western Siberia. He has opened the office, hired an office manager, transferred all Land O' Lakes FtF program assets from Moscow, and begun the process for identifying FtF clients. Land O' Lakes also fielded Mr. David Blood, former FtF Ukraine coordinator, to assist in this start-up process. Mr. Blood was in Novosibirsk for approximately one month. At the time of the writing of this report, Land O' Lakes was active in recruiting volunteers and the first scopes of work have been submitted from the Novosibirsk office.

The FtF Russia Program complied with the USAID moratorium on travel to Russia from December 26 through mid-January, due to anticipated Y2K problems. The FtF Consortium had been informed that this moratorium was anticipated to last through January. Therefore, no assignments were planned to start until January 29th. This caused a minor disruption of FtF Russia activities, but the Consortium is still confident we will achieve the level of effort as outlined in the work-plan.

Mr. Bob Resseguie, USAID/BHR, traveled to Russia in March to review FtF program activities. Mr. Resseguie was presented with a broad overview of program activities including meetings with program staff and visits to FtF clients in the Moscow and Saratov regions.

The FtF Russian Program is actively marketing the program's activities to potential host organizations and promoting program initiatives to the international donor community. During the last quarter, the FtF Consortium participated in 7 food expositions, conferences, and seminars in five oblasts. Mr. Jeffrey Singer, ACDI/VOCA Country Representative and FtF Program Director, represented the FtF program at the USAID hosted State Department Regional Initiative workshop. The FtF Program is active in three of the four Regional Initiative oblasts including Samara, Tomsk, and Novgorod. Program staff also made trips to 11 oblasts to promote FtF activities and identify new host organizations.

The FtF Consortium completed **19 volunteer assignments** during the second quarter of fiscal year 2000 with **28 host organizations**. It is also important to note that the FtF Consortium had written and submitted 108 scopes of work (108 volunteers) for Russia at the time of the writing of this report.

Volunteer	HQ #	Field #	Host Organization	Host Category	FtF Obj.	Service Provided
Keith Maxey	331001	MAV004	Lebedev Farm	Processor	2	Goat Herd Mngt.
			Borisovo Farm	Processor	2	Goat Herd Mngt.
			Nadezhda Farm	Processor	2	Goat Herd Mngt.
Naya Kenman*	331003	MAV010	FADR	Foundation	3	Project Monitoring
John Marenich	331005	SAV007	Sredneaktubinsk Canning Plant	Processor	2	Food Canning
			Vita JSC	Processor	2	Food Canning
Brian Wolfe	331006	MAV014	Food Corporation	Trade	2	Commodity Trading
John Konecny	331007	FAV001	Volgograd Biscuits Factory	Processor	2	Cookie Production
			Volgograd Bakery 2	Processor	2	Cookie Prod.
Ronald Layton	331008	SAV009	Samara Training Center	Business Center	3	Meat Processing
Anthony Kutter	331009	MAV016	Acodec	Processor	2	Cheese Prod.
			Borisovo Farm	Producer	2	Cheese Prod.
Damon Szymanski	331010	MAV017	Krasniy Kholm JSC	Producer	2	Dairy Herd Mngt.
William Broske	331013	SAV010	Novy Edem JSC	Processor	2	Cheese Prod.
John Blake	331014	SAV012	Krasnodonskoe	Producer	2	Emu Production
Doug Moorer	331015	SAV011	Krasnodonskoe	Producer	2	Emu Production
Peter Poss	331018	SAV013	Samara Training Center	Business Center	3	Poultry Prod.
Robert Coots	331019	MAV021	ACC Farmer Credit	Credit Coop	4	Ag. Credit
			RCC Asia Credit	Credit Coop	4	Ag. Credit
			Yagbodinskiy	Credit Coop	4	Ag. Credit
Don Wheeler	331021	MAV024	PP&E Dept of Min of Agriculture	Gov't Agency	3	Project Design
Ernst Graf	331029	SAV017	Samara Bakery	Processor	2	Bakery Technology
Mickey Foley	331030	SAV018	Mikhailovski Butter-Cheese Plant	Producer	2	Mushroom Prod.
			Saratov Ag Academy	Producer	2	Mushroom Prod.
Lucas Gallegos	331032	SAV019	Ravioli Bakery	Processor	2	Pastry Prod.
Dennis Buffington	331034	MAV030	Moscow State Agro-Engineering Univ.	Training Institution	3	Curriculum Dev't
Leonard Knoblock	331036	SAV021	Plodovy Sad	Cooperative	3	Business Mngt.
			Rurik JSC	Processor	2	Business Mngt.

* Staff Development Assignment completed by Ms. Naya Kenman, ACIDI/VOCA Associate Director of the E & E Division and Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist. Justification for the recruitment of Ms. Kenman to complete this assignment is detailed in the assignment description.

III. PROGRAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS

A. Firm-Level Assistance

During the second quarter, a total of **19 host organizations** received firm-level assistance including **six (6) producers, twelve (12) processors, and one (1) trade operation.**

The FtF Russia program is providing targeted assistance on meat and dairy processing and post harvest activities in the grain and vegetable sectors. The total number of hosts receiving assistance by sectors were six (6) grain, six (6) meat, nine (9) dairy, and five (5) vegetables (many of the hosts are engaged in more than one sector which is reflected in the total numbers).

Russian producers and processors continued their request for assistance on new product development, labeling, and packaging. This has been a consistent trend since the August 1998 financial crisis and represents FtF clients' understanding that they have an opportunity to recapture some of the lost market share to foreign imports. However, our clients also understand that customer preferences have changed and in order to be competitive an enterprise needs to offer more variety and a higher quality product that is well packaged and attractively labeled. During the last quarter, the FtF consortium worked with 8 host organizations on these issues including expanded assortment of baked goods, new cheese products, milk packaging, and labeling.

Another interesting trend has been the number of clients that have purchased new equipment or have expressed a true interest in purchasing new equipment (and have been able to demonstrate the financial resources necessary to complete the transaction). Volunteers recommendations of the need for new equipment coupled with the clients' inability to finance the purchase has historically been one of the most limiting factors of the FtF program. The recent increase of clients capable of procuring small-scale equipment demonstrates there is cash at the firm level and that enterprises are now willing to invest that cash in their operations. During the last quarter, three enterprises had recently purchased new equipment prior to the assignment and three additional enterprises are currently considering the purchase of new equipment in the near future. The FtF Consortium is also receiving requests for volunteers to demonstrate how to most effectively and efficiently install and utilize equipment recently purchased by our clients.

B. Agricultural Support Organizations

The FtF Consortium is implementing its FtF Russia program approach around a critical lesson learned: sustainable agricultural development in Russia will only be achieved when viable indigenous Agricultural Support Organizations (including associations, business support institutions, training institutes, and cooperatives) are developed to meet the wide ranging needs of agricultural enterprises. The FtF Russia program is working to build the capacity and sustainability of ASOs, enabling them to provide high quality services at the firm-level. The legacy of the FtF Russia program will be the presence of viable organizations providing business training and technology transfer services to agricultural producers, processors, and non-traditional financial institutions lending to the agricultural sector.

During the first quarter, the FtF Russia program began implementation of this strategy by assisting six (6) ASOs including one (1) cooperative, two (2) training institutes, two (2) business centers, and one (1) foundation.

C. Financial Institutions

The FtF Russia program continued its close collaboration with the Russian-American Lending (RAL) Program implemented by the Rural Credit Cooperation Development Fund (RCCDF) and ACDI/VOCA by fielding one volunteer to work with three rural credit cooperatives in Mary-El, Gorny-Altay, and Udmurtia. The RAL program was established to provide on-lending to credit cooperatives, who in turn could make production loans to their members, primarily private farmers. USDA (loan capital) and USAID (the Mobilizing Agricultural Credit Program) jointly fund the RAL program. At the time of the writing of this report the program had lent a total of 15,675,000 rubles to 14 rural credit cooperatives. A total of 4,400,000 rubles has been repaid and the program is experiencing 100 percent repayment. The fund currently has an outstanding loan portfolio of 11,275,000 rubles. USDA and the Ministry of Agriculture recently agreed to further support the program by contributing all of the proceeds from the sale of US donated seeds in 2000. This is estimated at 130 – 150 million rubles.

IV. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

The FtF Consortium has developed an overall approach to monitoring and impact assessment system that allows for both aggregating information on traditional BHR/PVC indicators and documenting indicators of achievement (results and impact) that coincide with strategic mission objectives. The FtF Russia program has implemented this comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system and developed a preliminary ACCESS database to track program achievement towards these objectives and indicators. The M&E system enables the FtF Consortium to monitor and report on program impact at various levels, while also providing useful information necessary to manage program activities. The M&E system is implemented at three stages in program implementation including scope of work development (including host organization base-line surveys), the volunteer assignment, and a field survey conducted after assignment completion. During the last quarter, the FtF Consortium completed the first two stages of M&E analysis on each assignment completed in the first quarter. The post-assignment surveys will be completed for these assignments in subsequent quarters as determined by FtF program staff and the fielded volunteer.

A. Program Objectives

The Consortium has defined four FtF program objectives that form the basis for setting targets, identifying appropriate indicators, and providing program focus. For each program objective, sub-objectives (targets) and respective indicators have also been identified. The complete menu of FtF program indicators and the FtF Russia's program progress toward achieving the objectives is attached in Appendix I. A primary indicator and additional secondary indicators have been identified for program impact based on the nature of the assignment and the volunteer's final report. Results will be certified through monitoring and evaluation surveys to be completed by FtF program staff. The following results are anticipated from second quarter activities:

FtF Program Objectives	Total No. of Hosts	Total No. of Vols
Objective 1: Set of best practices for volunteer TA developed and disseminated	28	19
Objective 2: Increased Sustainability of private agricultural enterprises (Firm-level)	19	12.5

Objective 3: Increased capacity of associations, cooperatives, and business support organizations to achieve sustainable service delivery and advocacy – (Agricultural Support Organizations)	6	5.5
Objective 4: Strengthened commercial bank and rural finance systems to provide credit and other services to agricultural enterprises (Credit and Finance)	3	1

B. USAID/Moscow Strategic Objectives

The FtF Russia program also impacts on USAID/Moscow's Strategic Objectives and Intermediate Results. USAID's programs in Russia are focused on private agricultural development, credit and finance, investment promotion, and policy reform. The overall economic development strategy for Russia has a strong emphasis on the financial sustainability of business support institutions and in improving the capacity of these institutions to provide services at the firm level. The appropriate USAID/Moscow Strategic Objective (SO) and Intermediate Result (IR) as it relates to the volunteer assignment is selected and included in the volunteer scope of work. The following USAID/Moscow SOs and IRs were addressed during the last quarter.

USAID/Mission Strategy	Total No. of Vol. Assignments
S.O. 1.3 – Accelerated Development of Growth of Private Enterprise	19
<i>IR 1.3.2 – Successful Models of Private Ownership and Modern Management Widely Replicated</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>IR 1.3.3 – Sustainable Network of Business Support Institutions Rendering Services to Entrepreneurs and Enterprises</i>	<i>3</i>
S.O. 1.6 – Increased Environmental Management Capacity to support Sustainable Economic Growth	0
<i>IR 1.6.3 – Improved Economic Mechanisms for Natural Resource Management and Environmental Protection</i>	<i>0</i>

C. Geographic Focus

The FtF Russia program strategy takes into account the vastness of Russia's landmass and the diversity of the agricultural products produced and processed. The FtF Consortium's strategy is to focus activities in the largest agricultural producing regions, while targeting (1) Meat and Dairy Processing; (2) Post-Harvest Activities related to grain and vegetables, and (3) Farm Credit and Finance. The FtF Russia program began implementation of its strategy to target firm-level assistance in three geographic regions: (1) Western Russia, (2) Volga, and (3) Siberia. At least 90 percent of all FtF Russia volunteers working at the firm-level will have at least one host in one of the thirteen targeted Russian oblasts. Agricultural support organizations and financial institutions located in the target regions are also given priority of assistance, but due to the potential wide-spread impact from assistance to these host organizations, geographic location is not a prohibitive factor.

During the second quarter, 19 host organizations (66%) were located in a focus oblast, 16 volunteers (84%) had at least one host in a focus oblast, and 11 volunteers (85%) working on firm-level assistance had at least one host in a focus oblast.

D. Total Beneficiaries

Total beneficiaries for the second quarter were calculated based on the de-briefing data sheets completed by each FtF volunteer.

Number of Direct Beneficiaries			
Female	577	Male	595
Number of Indirect Beneficiaries			
Female	6920	Male	7494

E. Total In-Kind Contribution

In-kind contribution is calculated at two levels: (1) host organization contribution and (2) estimated value of volunteer's time. The information for the volunteer certifies total in-kind contribution on the de-briefing data sheets. The host organization contribution is based on USAID rates for items such as lodging, M&IE, etc. A list of contribution by host is attached in Appendix V.

In-Kind Contribution	
Host Organization Contribution	\$15,245
Volunteer's Contribution	\$132,506
TOTAL In-Kind Contribution	\$147,751

F. Total Leveraged Resources by Host Organizations

The FtF Consortium works to assist its clients in leveraging additional financial resources for operations, program activities, and training. During the second quarter, three FtF clients leveraged financial resources for their activities.

Leveraged Resources	
Samara Training Center – Revenue Generated from two FtF volunteer Seminars	\$2,770 (79,000 rubles)
Volunteer financial donation to Nadezhda Farm	\$1,000
180 Donated Emu Eggs to Krasnodonskoe	\$14,140
Total Funds Leveraged	\$17,910

APPENDIX I
FtF Program Inputs and Outputs (Tables 1-4)

FTF Program Inputs and Outputs

Table I.1-Annual Volunteer Inputs

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
A. Total LOP number of volunteers ¹	32			
Male	30			
Female	2			
B. Annual number of international FTF volunteer trips ²	36			
C. Annual average cost per volunteer day ³	\$1,229.51			
D. Annual estimated value of FTF volunteers' professional time	\$233,393			

¹This number is cumulative calculating a volunteer only one time throughout the life of the project, regardless of the number of time the volunteer has travelled on volunteer assignments for ACDI/VOCA, Winrock International or Land O'Lakes.

²This number calculates the number of international trips taken by volunteers throughout the life of the project. This does not count multiple assignments or multiple hosts, but only the number of cross-Atlantic flights taken over the course of the project by volunteers.

³The calculation measures the cost of the project per volunteer day. Through the current period end of March 31, 2000), the project has estimated 636 volunteer days and has spent \$781,965.

FTF Program Inputs and Outputs

Table I.2-Cumulative Number of Volunteers and Assignments by US State of Origin

Regions	States	Number of Volunteers (see Table I.1, Row A) ¹				Number of Volunteer Assignments ²			
		Total LOP		This Period		Total LOP		This Period	
		Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Northeast									
	Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Delaware	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Maine	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
	Maryland	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	New Hampshire	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	New Jersey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	New York	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Pennsylvania	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0
	Rhode Island	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Vermont	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Washington, DC	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
	Subtotal	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	1
Southeast									
	Alabama	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
	Arkansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Florida	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
	Georgia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Kentucky	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Louisiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Mississippi	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	North Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	South Carolina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Tennessee	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Virginia	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	West Virginia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Subtotal	5	0	5	0	5	0	5	0
Midwest									
	Illinois	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Indiana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Iowa	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Kansas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Missouri	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0
	Nebraska	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Ohio	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Subtotal	5	0	2	0	5	0	2	0
Upper Midwest									
	Michigan	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
	Minnesota	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	North Dakota	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	South Dakota	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Wisconsin	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
	Subtotal	6	0	4	0	7	0	4	0
Rocky Mountain									
	Colorado	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Idaho	3	0	1	0	4	0	1	0
	Montana	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Utah	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Wyoming	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Subtotal	4	0	2	0	5	0	2	0
West Coast									
	Alaska	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	California	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Oregon	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
	Washington	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0
	Subtotal	4	0	2	0	5	0	2	0
Southwest									
	Arizona	2	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
	Nevada	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	New Mexico	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Oklahoma	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0
	Texas	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Subtotal	3	0	2	0	4	0	2	0
other									
	Guatemala	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Philippines	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	expat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	TOTAL	30	2	19	1	34	2	19	1

¹This number is cumulative. Each volunteer is only counted once in this row for the entire LOP.

²This number is cumulative, however it will reflect a double-counting of volunteers, as often a volunteer will perform multiple assignments, either by piggy-backing on a single trip or by making multiple volunteer trips.

FTF Program Inputs and Outputs

Table II-Annual Volunteer Outputs

	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02	FY 03
A. Annual estimated value of resources leveraged by the grantee/volunteers in the U.S. ¹	\$14,140			
B. Annual estimated value of resources leveraged by the host in host country ²	\$27,571			
C. Annual estimated value of resources mobilized by Host ³	\$36,081			
D. Annual total number of direct beneficiaries of FTF volunteer assistance ⁴	1831			
Male	950			
Female	881			
1. Annual number of persons receiving direct formal training (a subset of direct beneficiaries) ⁵	372			
Male	223			
Female	149			
E. Annual number of Hosts who have participated in U.S. based training and exchange programs through all sources (e.g. USIA, NET, Cochran, etc.)	0			

¹These funds are raised in the U.S. by the volunteer or grantee and counted as a matching contribution for the grant.

²These are funds leveraged by the host in the host country. This number is an estimate based on volunteer reporting of such contributions and also counts as a matching contribution for the grant.

³"Resources mobilized" are resources that FTF volunteers assist their hosts in accessing, such as various sources of credit, state assistance, PL 480 local currency, other donor assistance, etc.

⁴Direct beneficiaries receive face-to-face or hands on training or assistance from the FTF volunteer.

⁵Formal training would include an organized seminar in which participants are invited to specifically attend for planned and scheduled training.

FTF Program Inputs and Outputs

Table III - FTF Host Assignments Cumulative Summary

FTF Hosts	Life of Project	This Period¹
A. Host with a single FTF assignment.	37	20
B. Hosts with multiple FTF assignments.	8	5
Total number of Hosts	45	45

¹ This number represents the number of hosts worked with during the current reporting period. However, if the host has received only one volunteer assignment during the current reporting period, but has received assignment previously during the life of the project, that host will be counted under B, as having received multiple assignment. Line A will only count assignments during the current reporting period that have never before received a volunteer assignment under the current project.

FTF Program Inputs and Outputs

Table IV - Annual and Cumulative Total Number of FTF Hosts

	FY 00		FY 01		FY 02		FY 03	
Host Categories	Annual ¹	Cumulative ²	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative
A. Private Enterprises	30	30						
B. Organizations	10	10						
C. NGOs	0	0						
D. Rural Financial Institutions	5	5						
Total Number of Hosts	45	45						

¹ This number counts the total number of hosts worked with, by category, for the current fiscal year.

² This number counts the total number of hosts worked with, by category, over the life of the project, and does not at any time double-count host worked with any time during the project.

APPENDIX II
FtF Program Impacts with Hosts (Tables 5-7)

FTF Program Impacts with Hosts

Table V - Hosts with Improved Business Operations as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance

	FY 00			FY 01			FY 02			FY 03		
FTF Hosts	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted ¹	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target
A. Number of hosts providing new or improved products and/or services.	23	0	0%									
B. Number of hosts with production increases over pre-assignment levels.	0	0	0%									
C. Number of hosts with increased business efficiency or resource conservation. ⁴	65	0	0%									
D. Number of hosts receiving increased revenue/resources through increased sales receipts as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention.	6	0	0%									
E. Number of hosts with increased profits.	0	0	0%									

¹ The project has been structured in such a way that the measurement of impact on specific hosts will be measured at period increments throughout the project. Generally, the hosts will be examined for impact between 6 to 9 months after the completion of the assignment. Given the early stage of the project, there are no current measurements for impact. Starting with the next semi-annual report, the project will be able to report more accurately as to impact.

FTF Program Impacts with Hosts

Table VI - FTF Hosts with Improved Organizational Capacity as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance

FTF Hosts	FY 00			FY 01			FY 02			FY 03		
	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted ¹	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target
A. Number of organizations formed as a result of grantee/volunteer intervention. ⁴	4	0	0%									
B. Number of hosts using new or improved planning techniques, program methodologies and/or management practices, including the use of a business plan or a strategic plan.	21	0	0%									
C. Number of hosts with increased revenue/resources through new grants and/or increased fees.	1	0	0%									
D. Number of hosts that have increased their membership as a result of grantee/volunteer interventions.	6	0	0%									

¹ The project has been structured in such a way that the measurement of impact on specific hosts will be measured at period increments throughout the project. Generally, the hosts will be examined for impact between 6 to 9 months after the completion of the assignment. Given the early stage of the project, there are no current measurements for impact. Starting with the next semi-annual report, the project will be able to report more accurately as to impact.

FTF Program Impacts with Hosts

Table VII - FTF Hosts with Improved Services to Membership/Employees as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance

	FY 00			FY 01			FY 02			FY 03	
FTF Hosts	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted ¹	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted
A. Number of hosts that have successfully intervened on behalf of members with government or business.	0	0	0%								
B. Number of hosts with new training courses or new subject matter for courses to use with membership or associates.	11	0	0%								
C. Number of hosts with improved training materials and skills.	11	0	0%								

¹ The project has been structured in such a way that the measurement of impact on specific hosts will be measured at period increments throughout the project. Generally, the hosts will be examined for impact after the completion of the assignment. Given the early stage of the project, there are no current measurements for impact. Starting with the next semi-annual report, the project will be able to report more

% of Target

r impact
ore

APPENDIX III

**FtF Host with Improved Finance Services to the Agricultural
Sector as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance (Table 8)**

FTF Program Impacts with Hosts

Table VIII - FTF Host with Improved Financial Services to the Agricultural Sector as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance

FTF Hosts	FY 00			FY 01			FY 02			FY 03		
	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted ¹	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target
A. Number of Hosts with an increased number of agricultural related loans	5	0	0%									
B. Number of Hosts with loan delinquency rate < 10%	0	0	0%									
C. Number of Hosts that provide improved banking services to the agricultural sector ⁴												
1. Number of Hosts with an increase in average loan size	0	0	0%									
2. Number of Hosts with an increase in Producer Portfolio Value (ag production and processing loans)	0	0	0%									
3. Number of Hosts with an increased number of Branches/Groups	0	0	0%									
D. Number of Hosts with an increase in Enterprise Portfolio Value (microfinance loans)	0	0	0%									

¹ The project has been structured in such a way that the measurement of impact on specific hosts will be measured at period increments throughout the project. Generally, the hosts will be examined for impact between 6 to 9 months after the completion of the assignment. Given the early stage of the project, there are no current measurements for impact. Starting with the next semi-annual report, the project will be able to report more accurately as to impact.

APPENDIX IV
**FtF Hosts with Improved Use and/or Protection of the
Environment as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance
(Table 9)**

FTF Program Impacts with Hosts

Table IX - FTF Hosts with Improved Use and/or Protection of the Environment as a Result of Grantee/Volunteer Assistance

	FY 00			FY 01			FY 02			FY 03		
FTF Hosts	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted ¹	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target	Hosts Targeted	Hosts Impacted	% of Target
A. Number of Hosts adopting one or more practices to improve waste or pollution management.	0	0	0%									
B. Number of Hosts adopting one or more practices to improve natural resources management (soil, water, forest, grazing lands, national park land, etc.).	1	0	0%									

¹ The project has been structured in such a way that the measurement of impact on specific hosts will be measured at period increments throughout the project. Generally, the hosts will be examined for impact between 6 to 9 months after the completion of the assignment. Given the early stage of the project, there are no current measurements for impact. Starting with the next semi-annual report, the project will be able to report more accurately as to impact.

APPENDIX V
Increased Awareness in the U.S. Agricultural Sector
Concerning International Agricultural Development (Table
10)

FTF Program Impacts

Table X - Increased Awareness in the U.S. Agricultural Sector Concerning International Agricultural Development

Indicators	FY 00	FY 01	FY 02
A. Number of FTF volunteers who have performed public outreach activities.	12		
B. Number of media events by implementors and FTF volunteers.	9		
C. Number of group presentations by implementors and FTF volunteers.	8		

ational

FY 03